

BC FILED
7/1/2025

RM

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

THOMAS G. BRUTON
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

MARY MADISON,
Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 23CV16476
Honorable Judge Manish S. Shah

CREATIVE WERKS, LLC,
and Steve Schroeder, individually,
Defendants.

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF CLERICAL FILING ISSUE AND REQUEST TO
ACCEPT TIMELY SUBMISSION**

NOW COMES Plaintiff, Mary Madison, and respectfully submits this Notice to clarify a clerical filing issue that impacted one of four timely submissions made on June 25, 2025, and to request that the Court accept the enclosed resubmitted filing. In support, Plaintiff states:

1. On June 25, 2025, Plaintiff submitted four separate filings to the Clerk's Office throughout the day, each intended to be docketed individually. These included:
 - Rule 56 Motion and Memorandum and a separate list of undisputed facts and Exhibits, and a certificate of service.
 - Rule 12f Motion and Memorandum, and a certificate of service.
 - Rule 12c Motion and Memorandum and a separate list of undisputed facts, and a certificate of service.
 - Estoppel Motion and Memorandum and a certificate of service.
2. After observing no response from the Clerk's office and that none of the documents appeared on the docket, Plaintiff contacted the Clerk's Office for clarification.
3. On June 30, 2025, Plaintiff received an email from the Clerk's Office (attached hereto as Exhibit A) indicating that the documents had been returned due to formatting issues—specifically that one or more exhibits lacked a cover sheet or were not attached to the document they supported. The Clerk's Office also acknowledged that its original rejection notice had failed to transmit due to file size limitations.

4. The Clerk's Office further represented that the submitted documents were stamped to confirm receipt; however, Plaintiff did not receive any stamped documents, and the filings were not initially reflected on the public docket.
5. Based on the Clerk's communication, it appears the Office may have treated all four filings as a single submission rather than processing them as separate documents filed at different times.
6. As of this filing, three of the four submissions now appear to have been processed and docketed. However, one filing remains unprocessed and absent from the docket.
7. In the interest of expediency and clarity, Plaintiff is hereby resubmitting the unprocessed filing with this Notice and respectfully requests that the Court accept it for docketing and deem it timely filed as of June 25, 2025, the date of original submission.
8. Plaintiff files this request in good faith and respectfully asks the Court to preserve her timely filing and resolve any prejudice caused by the clerical processing error.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully asks that the Court:

- Accept the resubmitted document for filing nunc pro tunc to June 25, 2025;
- Confirm that all four original filings are reflected on the docket; and
- Grant such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Mary Madison

Dated: July 1, 2025

/S/ Mary Madison
9758 S Charles
Chicago, IL 60643
6152396684
Mdj123197@aol.com